

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,** )  
  )  
  )  
**Plaintiff,**                      )  
  )  
  )  
**v.**                                 )                                      **Case No. CR-05-043-Raw**  
  )  
  )  
**JIMMY C. CHISUM,**              )  
  )  
  )  
**Defendant.**                     )

**ORDER**

Before the Court is the motion of the defendant to reconsider. The pertinent background to defendant's convictions is set forth in *United States v. Chisum*, 502 F.3d 1237 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir.2007), *cert. denied*, 552 U.S. 1211 (2008). Defendant subsequently filed a motion pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2255, which this court denied. On appeal, the Tenth Circuit denied a certificate of appealability and dismissed. See *United States v. Chisum*, 343 Fed.Appx. 335 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir.2009). On May 18, 2012, the court denied defendant's motion for writ of *coram nobis*.

Plaintiff calls his present motion one of *coram vobis*<sup>1</sup>. He reiterates the same arguments this court and the Tenth Circuit have rejected before. The Seventh Circuit holds that a coram vobis motion in a criminal case may be treated as one under §2255. *Melton v. United States*, 359 F.3d 855 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir.2004). If so treated, the present motion is untimely. In the court's previous order (addressing the coram nobis motion) the court ruled that, as a

---

<sup>1</sup>"Coram nobis is a writ of ancient common law origin, as is the related (and seldom used) writ of coram vobis." *Puente v. United States*, 676 F.2d 141, 145 n.2 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir.1982).

common law writ, no statutory time period was applicable<sup>2</sup>. The court declines to rule the motion untimely, but instead denies the motion on the merits.

The court will not enter a separate judgment because *coram vobis* is the continuation of a criminal proceeding, whereas habeas corpus is the initiation of a separate civil proceeding. *Cf. United States v. Morgan*, 346 U.S. 502, 506 (1954).

It is the order of the court that the motion of the defendant to reconsider (#185) is hereby DENIED.

**ORDERED THIS 18th DAY OF JANUARY, 2013.**



Ronald A. White  
United States District Judge  
Eastern District of Oklahoma

---

<sup>2</sup>The doctrine of laches might apply in certain circumstances, but the court declines to invoke that doctrine here.